



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,196	12/15/2003	Kyoung Sub Kim	049128-5139	4793
9629	7590	12/01/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			TON, MINH TOAN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/734,196

Applicant(s)

KIM, KYOUNG SUB

Examiner

Toan Ton

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/01/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2871

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art (APA hereinafter, Figures 1-5).

APA discloses a liquid crystal display module and a method of manufacturing thereof comprising: a liquid crystal panel 4; a bottom cover 2 having a plurality of lamps 12 installed there above; a reflection sheet 14 for reflecting the light generated from the lamps; and a main support having openings 19 in which the lamps are inserted, an extension part extending from the openings, a supporting member (e.g., 6) for supporting the liquid crystal panel.

The limitation not explicitly disclosed by APA is the main support having the extension part and the supporting member as an integral frame.

However, the concept of elements being integrally/simultaneously formed is common and known in the art for achieving advantages such as reducing manufacturing cost. Furthermore, it has been held as at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the main support having the extension part and the supporting member as an integral frame for achieving advantages such as reducing manufacturing cost, and also it has been held as at least obvious, see at least *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965)

APA discloses the inside wall of the extension part is inclined at a designated slope (see at least Figure 1), the extension part reflects light from the lamps to the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figure 1), an aligning member formed on the supporting member to align the liquid crystal panel with the main support member (see at least Figure 1), the supporting member together with the aligning member form an 'L' shape that supports and aligns the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figure 1), a diffusion plate 16 for diffusing the lights generated from the lamps (see at least Figure 1), the bottom cover includes a plurality of projections, a plurality of optical sheets on the diffusion plate for guiding light toward the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figure 1), a top cover for enclosing the main support and the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figure 1).

Materials such as white mold or resin used for the framing member are common and known in the art for advantages such as simplifying the manufacturing process. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ materials such as white mold or resin for advantages such as simplifying the manufacturing process.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo et al (US 6639636).

Yoo discloses a liquid crystal display module and a method of manufacturing thereof comprising: a liquid crystal panel 110; a bottom cover having a plurality of lamps 182 installed there above; a reflection sheet 170 for reflecting the light generated from the lamps; and a main support 160 having openings in which the lamps are inserted, an extension part (bottom portion of 160 extending up to the upper portion of 160) extending from the openings, and a supporting member (upper portion of 160) for supporting the liquid crystal panel (see Figures 1-4).

The limitation not explicitly disclosed by APA is the main support having the extension part and the supporting member as an integral frame.

However, the concept of elements being integrally/simultaneously formed is common and known in the art for achieving advantages such as reducing manufacturing cost.

Furthermore, it has been held as at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the main support having the extension part and the supporting member as an integral frame for achieving advantages such as reducing manufacturing cost, and also it has been held as at least obvious, see at least *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965).

Yoo discloses the inside wall of the extension part is inclined at a designated slope (see at least Figures 2-3), the extension part inherently reflects (some) light from the lamps to the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figures 2-2), an aligning member (element formed on upper portion of 160/support member) formed on the supporting member to align the liquid crystal panel with the main support member (see at least Figures 2-3), the supporting member together with the aligning member form an 'L' shape that supports and aligns the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figures 2-3), a diffusion plate 220 for diffusing the lights generated from the lamps (see at least Figures 2-3), the bottom cover includes a plurality of projections, a plurality of optical sheets on the diffusion plate for guiding light toward the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figures 2-3), a top cover 230 for enclosing the main support and the liquid crystal panel (see at least Figures 2-3).

Materials such as white mold or resin used for the framing member are common and known in the art for advantages such as simplifying the manufacturing process. Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2871

would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ materials such as white mold or resin for advantages such as simplifying the manufacturing process.

Response to Arguments


2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2303.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 15, 2006


TOANTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER